UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,332	04/06/2001	Michael Kelbaugh	723-1081	6939
	7590 06/23/200 NDERHYE, P.C.	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	NGUYEN, PHILLIP H		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary Examiner		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Phillip H. Nguyen The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER. FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	Office Action Comments	09/827,332	KELBAUGH ET AL.				
The MALING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address — Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Estimation of time must be available under the processors of 3 CFR 1.136(s) in overus towords any angle to tention find the processor of the communication of the processor of the communication of the communication, seen if timely filled, reply reduce any searned patent term equations. Seen 37 CFR 1.704(b) and the mailing date of this communication, seen if timely filled, reply reduce any searned patent term equations. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) and the mailing date of this communication, seen if timely filled, reply reduce any searned patent term equations. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) and the mailing date of this communication, seen if timely filled, reply reduce any searned patent term equations. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) and the processor of the communication, seen if timely filled, reply reduce any search patent term equations. Status Status Pill Responsive to communication(s) filled on 26 February 2009. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3b) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Expanded Translations. 4b) Claim(s) 1.1012 21.23.13.33.90.62.61.63.71 and 73.85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. 5b) Claim(s) 1.1012 21.23.31.33.90.62.61.63.71 and 73.85 is/are rejected. 7c) Claim(s) 1.1012 21.23.31.33.90.62.61.63.71 and 73.85 is/are rejected. 7c) The drawing(s) filled on 1 is/are allowed. 1b) The drawing(s	Oπice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Familians of three may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1586), in not event, however, may a ringly be finally float - Falancians of three may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1586), in not event, however, may a ringly be finally float - Falancian or ringly schief in set of eaberded period for ringly will, by a shade, cause the application to become ANDROWITO, (SEUS.C. § 133). - Falancian or ringly white its set of eaberded period for ringly will, by a shade, cause the application to become ANDROWITO, (SEUS.C. § 133). - Falancian or ringly white its set of eaberded period for ringly will, by a shade, cause the application to become ANDROWITO, (SEUS.C. § 133). - Falancian or ringly white its set of eaberded period for ringly will by a shade. - Falancian or ringly white its set of eaberded period for ringly will by a shade. - Falancian or ringly white its set of eaberded period for ringly will by a shade. - Falancian or ringly white its set of eaberded period for ringly will be a shade. - Falancian or ringly will be set of eaberded period for ringly will be a shade. - Falancian or ringly will be set of eaberded period for ringly will be a shade. - Falancian or ringly will be set of eaberded period for ringly will be a shade. - Falancian or ringly will be set of eaberded period for ringly and the cause of the communication. - Falancian or ringly shade and the ringly shade. - Falancian or ringly shade and the ringly is of the ringly shade. - Falancian or ringly shade and the ringly shade and the shade of the cause of the period shade. - Falancian or ringly shade and the ringly shade and the shade of the cause of the period shade. - Falancian or ringly shade and the ringly shade and the ringly shade and the ringly shade and the ringly shade. - Falancian or ringly shade and the ringly shade and the ringly shade and the r		Phillip H. Nguyen	2191				
WHICHEVER IDONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time namy be available under the provided and rest to the market of the communication of 37 CFR 1.13(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (3) MONITIS from the mailing date of time communication. - Feathor to reply visibility the set or restricted provide from you fill by daths, cause the supplication become ABANDOED (30 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Citics better than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any searced patient time adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.71(b). Status 1) ☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2009. 2a) ☑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 ☑ Claim(s) 1-10.12-21,23-31.33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5 ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6 ☑ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 ☐ Claim(s) is/are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9 ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing shee(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to see 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12 ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2009. 2a	 WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any 						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 3 ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 ☐ Claim(s) 1-10.12-21.23-31,33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s)	Status						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 3 ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 ☐ Claim(s) 1-10.12-21.23-31,33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s)	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Fe	bruary 2009.					
3 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 Claim(s) 1-10.12-21.23-31.33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5 Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6 Claim(s) 1-10.12-21.23-31.33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are rejected. 7 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 Claim(s) is/are objected to by the Examiner. 10 The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b							
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4)		, 					
Al) Claim(s) 1-10.12-21.23-31.33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Internation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)							
4) Claim(s) 1-10.12-21.23-31.33-50.52-61.63-71 and 73-85 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 1) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Paper No(s) Mail Date	ologod in addordance with the practice and c	x parte quayre, 1000 C.D. 11, 10	0.0.210.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a), Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.	Disposition of Claims						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 1) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-10,12-21,23-31,33-50,52-61,63-71 and 73-85</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	Application Papers						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	·.					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1.	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	 a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application							
	2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ite				

Art Unit: 2191

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 2/26/2009.

2. Claims 1-10,12-21,23-31,33-50,52-61,63-71 and 73-85 remain pending in this application and have been considered below with claims 11, 22, 32, 51, 62, and 72 have been cancelled, and claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-31, 33-50, 52-60, 63-71, 73-85 have been amended.

Response to Amendment

- 3. The objection to claim 77 is hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
- 4. The rejection to claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-31, 33-45, 52-60, and 81-85 under 35 U.S.C. 101 non-statutory is hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
- 5. The rejection to claims 2-10, 12-20, 23-31, 33-40, 42-50, 52-60, 63-71, 73-80, and 82-85 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
- 6. The rejection to claims 1-8, 14-16, 18-21, 23-29, 35-37, 39-46, 48, 54-56, 58-60, and 81-85 is maintained.

.Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 2/26/2009 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

Art Unit: 2191

Applicant argues:

1. Haswell fails to teach "providing, in response to said user identification information, at least one bug tracking related menu, the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development process." The user roles in Haswell are related to the actual end-user roles (such as a customer, a manager, and an employee) used during the implementation and migration of software application.

2. Wygodny and Haswell fail to teach "transmitting at least the edited bug related information via the Internet to a second user having a second role different from the first role in developing said software package.

Examiner respectfully disagrees:

1. Wygodny teaches a bug tracking system for monitoring and analyzing the execution of computer program which is accessible using an Internet browser (see at least col. 4:48-49). The bug tracking system in Wygodny provides bug tracking related menus such as a menu bar, a dockable toolbar, a status bar, etc., to developer, tester, etc. (see at least col. 8:57-60). However, Wygodny does not explicitly teach the bug tracking related menus are provided based on the identified user roles. Haswell teaches authenticating of the user and the contents are provided based on the user roles (see at least the table col. 49-50). Regardless whether or not the user roles in Haswell related to debugging, implement or migrating of the software application, Haswell cures the deficiency by using the technique of providing contents to the identified user based on user roles. The combination would have been obvious because using Haswell's

Art Unit: 2191

approach, Wygodny's bug tracking system would provide the contents to the identified user based on the user roles.

2. Wygodny teaches "the TCI file 120 and the trace log file 122 are preferably small enough to be sent via email between developer 112 and the user 110" (see at least col. 6:18-20). The developer and the tester each have a different role. Furthermore, as explained above, Haswell cures the deficiency by teaching user roles.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 1-8, 14-16, 18-21, 23-29, 35-37, 39-42, 43-46, 48, 54-56, 58-60, and 81-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,282,701 to Wygodny et al. (hereinafter called Wygodny) in view of US Patent No. 6,701,514 to Haswell et al. (hereinafter called Haswell).

Per claims 1, 6, 27:

Wygodny discloses:

A method for processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in software package development comprising the steps of:

providing a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and analyze the execution of a computer program") which is accessible using an Internet browser (col. 3, lines 14-15graphical user interface"); one bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help."")

Wygodny does not explicitly discloses processing user identification information including a password; and providing, in response to said user identification information, the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development process.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing user identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"); and providing, in response to said user identification information (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information..., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored..., based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their

responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of processing user identification information including a password; and providing, in response to said user identification information, the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development process as taught by Haswell into the method of debugging a computer program as taught by Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have log-in information and then display the content based on user's role so that user can only access those components/program/modules which they have been authorized to.

Per claim 21:

Wygodny discloses:

A method of processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in software package development comprising the steps of: providing a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and analyze the execution of a computer program") which is accessible using an Internet browser (col. 3, lines 14-15graphical user interface"); a bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60

"The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and

a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help.""), editing bug related information using said bug tracking related menu (col. 6, lines 18-20 "the developer can edit the TCI file 120 or create a new TCI file 120 while viewing results from a trace log file 122"); and transmitting at least the edited bug related information via the Internet to a second user (col. 6, lines 51-52 "the TCI file 120, and the trace log file 122 are preferably small enough to be sent via email between the developer 112 and the user 110").

Wygodny does not explicitly discloses processing a first user identification information including a password; providing, in response to said user identification information, the contents of which vary based on a first role, of said first user, in the software development process; a second role different from the first role in developing said software package.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing a first user identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"); and providing, in response to said user identification information (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), the contents of which vary based on a first role, of said first user, in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information.., that is associated with the user.., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information

associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.) a second role different from the first role in developing said software package (see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities).

Per claim 41, 42:

Wygodny discloses:

A method of processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in software package development comprising the steps of:

providing a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and analyze the execution of a computer program") accessible via the Interact (col. 3, lines 14-15 "graphical user interface");

retrieving from a database associated with said bug tracking system (col. 5, lines 44-53 "An agent-side trace library... The client-side trace library.., the agent-side trace library 124 are referred to collectively as the "trace library."...obtain the trace information") a list of bugs associated with an identified software package (col. 2, lines 54-55 "identifying and isolating bugs within a client program"); and

sorting said list of bugs (col. 7, lines 39-40 "analyzer 106 is used to analyze the trace data and isolate the bug") in accordance with any of one a plurality of user selected sort criteria (col. 8, lines 40-43 "developer 112 to open multiple trace tree windows and define a different filter (i.e., sorting) for each of window.., multiple windows with different

filters are handled by the User Interface").

Wygodny does not explicitly disclose processing user identification information including a password, wherein the processing includes determining the aspects of a system that a user is entitled to access based on a user's role in the development process.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing user identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"); and wherein the processing includes determining the aspects of a system that a user is entitled to access (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), based on a user's role in the development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information..., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored..., based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Per claim 81:

Wygodny discloses:

A method for processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in software package development comprising the steps of:

enabling access to a bug tracking system (col. 4, lines 48-49 "BugTrapper tools are used to monitor and analyze the execution of a computer program") using an Internet browser (col. 3, lines 14-15 "graphical user interface");

one bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help."").

Wygodny does not disclose processing user identification information including a password from a first user having a first role in the software development process which is different from at least a second role, of at least a second user, in the software development process; providing, in response to said user information from the first user, the contents of which vary based on the first user's role in the software development process; processing user identification information including a password from the second user; and providing, in response to said user identification information from the second user, at least, different from the first bug tracking menu, the contents of which vary based on the second user's role in the software development process.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system processing user identification information including a password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password") from a first user having a first role in the software development process which is different from at least a second role,

Art Unit: 2191

of at least a second user, in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information..., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored.., based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.); providing, in response to said user information from the first user (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), the contents of which vary based on the first user's role in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated with the user... single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored.., based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.); processing user identification information including a password from the second user (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"); and providing, in response to said user identification information from the second user (col. 25, lines 56 "the users is authenticated"), at least, different from the first bug tracking menu, the contents of which vary based on the second user's role in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information.., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored..., based on the

information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.) Note here the first and second user in Haswell is developer and tester as shown in table on col. 49-50.

Per claims 2-5, 23-26, and 43-46:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, Wygodny discloses the bug tracking related menu as applied to claims 1, 21, and 41 above. Wygodny does not explicitly disclose that the menu (content) are tailored to users e.g., testers, project coordinator, developer.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system that a single interface i.e., content is tailored based on the information associated with the user (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information..., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored... based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the menu (content) are tailored to users e.g., testers, project coordinator, developer as taught by Haswell into the method for debugging the software as taught by Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have the menu (content) are tailored to users e.g., testers, project coordinator, developer so that user can only access those components/program/modules which they have been authorized to.

Per claims 7, 8, 28, 29, and 48:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny disclose:

accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package (col. 5, lines 44-53 "An agent-side trace library... The client-side trace library.., the agent-side trace library 124 are referred to collectively as the "trace library.".., obtain the trace information" and col. 2, lines 54-55 "identifying and isolating bugs within a client program"); and

sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user (col. 7, lines 39-40 "analyzer 106 is used to analyze the trace data and isolate the bug" and col. 8, lines 40-43 "developer 112 to open multiple trace tree windows and define a different filter (i.e., sorting) for each of window.., multiple windows with different filters

are handled by the User Interface").

Per claim 14-16, 35-37, and 54-56:

The rejection of claim 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny disclose:

transmitting a bug related message (col. 3, lines 31-32 "developer sends the TCI file for the particular client to a remote user") using a provided bug related menu (col. 4, line 48 and col. 8, lines 57-60).

Wygodny does not explicitly disclose a first user having a first role in developing said software package to a second user having a second role in developing said software package.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system a first user having a first role in developing said software package to a second user having a second role in developing said software package (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information..., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored..., based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

The feature of providing a first user having a first role in developing said software package to a second user having a second role in developing said software package would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Per claim 18, 39, 58:

The rejection of claim 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny disclose:

A method according to claim 1, further including the steps of: generating a bug related communication (col. 5, lines 48-49) using a bug tracking related menu (col. 4, lines 48); transmitting said bug related communication to a recipient via the Internet (col. 6, lines 51-52).

Wygodny does not explicitly disclose encrypting said bug related communication

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system encrypting said bug related communication (col. 81, lines 36-37).

The feature of providing encrypting said bug related communication would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Page 16

Per claims 20 and 60:

The rejection of claims 1 and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny

disclose:

editing bug related information using said at least one bug tracking related menu (col. 6,

lines 18- 20 "the developer can edit the TCI file 120 or create a new TCI file 120 while

viewing results from a trace log file 122").

Per claims 19, 40, and 59:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Wygodny

does not explicitly disclose accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be

performed with respect to an identified software package.

However, Haswell discloses in an analogous computer system accessing a test plan

identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software

package (col. 50, lines 40-4Y'Develop and execute a test plan to properly exercise new

application including new, modified, and unmodified functionality").

The feature of providing accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be

performed with respect to an identified software package would be obvious for the set

forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 82-85 are the method claim corresponding to method claims 2-5 respectively,

and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 2-5 respectively, above, as noted above.

10. Claims 9-10, 12-13, 30, 31, 33, 34, 49-50, 52, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wygodny, Haswell in view of US Pub. No. 2001/0049697 to Johndrew et al. (hereinafter called Johndrew).

Per claims 9-10, 12-13, 30, 31, 33, 34, 49, 50, 52, and 53:

The rejection of claims 8, 28, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Wygodny nor Haswell explicitly disclose wherein said sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug.

However, Johndrew discloses in an analogous computer system sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug (page 3 and 4, paragraph 46 "FIG. 7 shows the data collected by the process of FIG. 6. Bug ID screen 700 includes the query component selection index 310, a bug identifier header 705, a bug headline 710 and a release table 715. Bug identifier header 705 gives the bug identifier associated with the information on the screen... Bug headline 710 contains a short one line description of the bug... Column 725 indicates the status of the bug... Column 730 contains the date and time that software fixing the bug").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of sorting/identifying bugs based on unique identifiers as taught by Johndrew into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in the combination system by Wygodny and Haswell. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to sort the bugs to provide complete bugs free software application to client as suggested by Johndrew (page 1, paragraph 10).

11. Claims 17, 38, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wygodny, Haswell in view of admitted prior art (APA).

Per claims 17, 38, and 57:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Wygodny nor Haswell explicitly disclose attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug.

However, APA discloses attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug (Applicant's specification, page 2, lines 9-11 "tester... associate a tester recorded sequence of game screen displays to provide a visual depiction of the error sequence")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of displaying a digitized video file for visually displaying as taught in APA into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in the combination system by Wygodny and Haswell. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to display the bug information which is would be for video game to have better understanding of the bugs found during testing as suggested in APA (pages 3, lines 4-12).

12. Claims 61, 63-69, 75-77, 79-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haswell in view of Wygodny.

Per claim 61, 67:

Haswell discloses: a software bug related processing and tracking system comprising: a first computer system for use by a software developer including a processing system for executing an Internet browser (Fig. 32, element 3200);

an encryption system coupled to said first computer for encrypting data transmitted via the Internet by said first computer (col. 81, lines 36-37 "encryption to protect your data as it's sent over an insecure network");

a second computer system for use by a software tester including a processing system for executing an Internet browser (Fig. 33, element 3300);

a third computer system for use by a software project coordinator including a processing system for executing an Internet processor (col. 49, lines 37-45 "Technical Manager

Art Unit: 2191

Typically an IS department head with responsibility for the purchase and/or support of hardware and software. In configuration management, this role is more software oriented. Other responsibilities include: Assign development and support staff to projects. Review (accept/reject) technical approach proposed for projects. Monitor development and support budgets and personnel - status of projects") [Here having an computer for technical manager would be inherent since the technical manager is responsible for assigning and completion of the job.]; and a web server for storing a bug tracking system and for permitting an authorized software developer, an authorized software tester, and an authorized project coordinator to access said bug tracking system and to communicate with each other via said bug tracking system (col. 25, 51-53 "The side server has information stored on it including preferences, roles, and details relating to users" and col. 57, lines 3-9 "A component within MTS utilizes role-based security to determine who may or may not have access to a specific COM component. A role is a symbolic name that defines a group of users for a package of components. Roles extend Windows NT security to allow a developer to build secured components in a distributed application"), and in response to received user identification information, including a password password (col. 25, lines 66-67 "user may be authenticated by verifying a user name and a password"), for providing, the contents of which vary based on the user's role as a software developer, software tester or software project coordinator in the software development process (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the information... that is associated with the user... single interface (i.e., the

content) is tailored... based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.).

Haswell does not explicitly disclose at least one bug tracking related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system a bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help."").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of having a bug related menu as taught by Wygodny into the method of authorizing and displaying content based on user's role as taught by Haswell. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have a bug related menu to monitore the parallel execution ofmultiprocessor system as suggested by Wygodny (col. 2, lines 28-50).

The feature of providing bug tracking related menu would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claims 63-66:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated, and further, Haswell discloses provide the contents based on user's role in software development process as applied to claim 61 above. Haswell does not explicitly disclose bug tracking related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system a bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines 57-60 "The analyzer frame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar 306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File," "Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help."").

The feature of providing bug tracking related menu would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claim 68, 69:

The rejection of claims 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell does not explicitly disclose accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package; and sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package (col. 5, lines 44-53 "An agent-side trace library... The client-side trace library..., the agent-side trace library 124 is referred to collectively as the "trace library."..., obtain the trace information" and col. 2, lines 54- 55 "identifying and isolating bugs within a client program"); and sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user (col. 7, lines 39-40 "analyzer 106 is used to analyze the trace data and isolate the bug" and col. 8, lines 40-43 "developer 112 to open multiple trace tree windows and define a different filter (i.e., sorting) for each of window... multiple windows with different filters are handled by the User Interface").

The feature of providing accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package; and sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claim 75-77:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell disclose:

a first user having a first role in developing said software package to a second user having a second role in developing said software package (col. 25, lines 59-65 "upon authentication of the identity of the userthe user is allowed to view and change the

information..., that is associated with the user..., single interface (i.e., the content) is tailored..., based on the information associated with the user" also see col. 54-56 and see the table on col. 49-50 which defines the user's roles and their responsibilities, e.g., if the user is a tester, the interface will be tailored based upon the tester's role and will be displayed.)

Haswell does not explicitly disclose transmitting a bug related message.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system transmitting a bug related message (col. 3, lines 31-32 "developer sends the TCI file for the particular client to a remote user") using a provided bug related menu (col. 4, line 48 and col. 8, lines 57-60).

The feature of providing transmitting a bug related message would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of claim 61.

Per claim 79:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell discloses accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software package (col. 50, lines 40-43"Develop and execute a test plan to properly exercise new application including new, modified, and unmodified functionality").

Art Unit: 2191

Per claim 80:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, Haswell does not explicitly disclose

edit bug related information in response to user input via at least one bug tracking

related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system edit bug related

information in response to user input (col. 6, lines 18-20 "the developer can edit the TCI

file 120 or create a new TCI file 120 while viewing results from a trace log file 122") via

at least one bug tracking (col. 4, lines 48 "BugTrapper tools") related menu (col. 8, lines

57-60 "The analyzer flame 300 further provides a menu bar 304, a dockable toolbar

306, and a status bar 312. The menu bar 304 provides drop-down menus labeled "File,"

"Edit," "View," "Executable," and "Help."").

The feature of providing edit bug related information in response to user input via at

least one bug tracking related menu would be obvious for the set forth in the rejection of

claim 61.

13. Claims 70-71, 73-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Haswell, Wygodny in view of US Pub. No. 2001/0049697 to Johndrew et al.

(hereinafter called Johndrew).

Per claims 70-71, 73-74:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, neither Haswell nor Wygodny explicitly disclose wherein said sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug.

However, Johndrew discloses in an analogous computer system sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug (page 3 and 4, paragraph 46 "FIG. 7 shows the data collected by the process of FIG. 6. Bug ID screen 700 includes the query component selection index 310, a bug identifier header 705, a bug headline 710 and a release table 715. Bug identifier header 705 gives the bug identifier associated with the information on the screen... Bug headline 710 contains a short one line description of the bug... Column 725 indicates the status of the bug... Column 730 contains the date and time that software fixing the bug").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of sorting/identifying bugs based on unique identifiers as taught by Johndrew into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in the combination system by Haswell and Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to sort the bugs to provide complete bugs free software application to client as suggested by

Johndrew (page 1, paragraph 10).

14. Claim 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Haswell, Wygodny in view of admitted prior art (APA).

Per claim 78:

The rejection of claim 61 is incorporated and further, neither Haswell nor Wygodny

explicitly disclose attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually

displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug.

However, APA discloses attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually

displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug (Applicant's

specification, page 2, lines 9-11 "tester... associate a tester recorded sequence of game

screen displays to provide a visual depiction of the error sequence").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of displaying a digitized video file for

visually displaying as taught in APA into the method for monitoring the software bug as

taught in the combination system by Haswell and Wygodny. The modification would be

obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to display the bug

information which is would be for video game to have better understanding of the bugs

found during testing as suggested in APA (pages 3, lines 4-12).

Art Unit: 2191

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PN 6/19/2009

/Wei Y Zhen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191